

*City of San Jose*

## ***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

### **Summary of Task Force Meeting #22 on September 13, 2004 151 West Mission Street (Room 202 a and b)**

#### **Task Force Members Present:**

Mayor Ron Gonzales (co-chair), Councilmember Forrest Williams (co-chair), Vice Mayor Pat Dando, Supervisor Don Gage, Christopher Platten, Chuck Butters, Craig Edgerton, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Helen Chapman, Jim Cunneen, Ken Saso, Russ Danielson, Steve Schott Jr., and Steve Speno.

#### **Task Force Members Absent:**

Neil Struthers, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins and Terry Watt.

#### **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:**

Steve Kinsella (Gavilan College), Rebecca Tolentino (City of Morgan Hill), Tedd Farrone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Growth), Kyle Simpson (Greenbelt Alliance), Pat Sausedo (NAIOP), Dawn Cameron (County Roads), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Tim Steele (Sobrato Development Corporation), Sarah Muller (Working Partnerships), Mike Tasosa (VTA), Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group), and **Tim Steele (Sobrato Development)**.

#### **City and other Public Agencies Staff Present:**

Councilmember Linda LeZotte, Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Keith Stamps (District 2), Denelle Fedor (District 10), John Mills (Council District 6), Luke Vong (DOT), Gerry De Guzman (Public Works), Rachael Gibson (Supervisor Don Gage's office), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE) and Rebecca Flores (Housing).

## **Consultants:**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Musbach (EPS), Darin Smith (EPS), Padru Kang (Dahlin Group), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies), Jim Thompson (HMH) and Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates).

## **Community Members Present:**

Lowell Tran, Eric Brandenburg, Brian Schmidt, Annie Saso, Ray Russo Jr., Kai Kazuto Mikami, Frank Crane, Richard Barbari, Geoff Gnire, Vic LoBue, Wayne O' Connell, Esteban Colil, Richard DeSmet, Marty Estrada, Chris Marchese, Jack Faraone, Liz Hirata, Peter Silva, Rosalie Cacitti, D Martin, Don Weden, Lee Wieder, Nathan Wassama, Camille Campbell, Beverly Stewart, Sean Morley, Jack Kuzia, Virginia Holtz, Salvatore & Amanda Saso, Marty Cheel, Roger Costa, Lee Lester, Tracy Chew, Jim Lightbody, Eric Flippo, Lisa Flippo, Consuelo V. Crosby, Jerry Amaro, Libby Lucas, Janet Hebert, G Pitri, Joshua D. Lo Bue, Hanson Hom, Mark Sellers, Crisand Giles, Denise Glasco, John Kuzia, Mark Fantozzi, and Garnetta Annable.

## **1. Welcome:**

The meeting convened at 5:30 p.m. with Mayor Ron Gonzales welcoming everyone in attendance to the 22nd Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force meeting.

## **2. Acceptance of the August 30, 2004 Task Force Meeting Summary:**

Mayor Ron Gonzales called for a motion to accept the meeting summary for the August 30, 2004 meeting, and the motion passed unanimously.

## **3. Discussion of Preliminary Land Use Plan:**

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, indicated that the discussion of land use for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) would begin tonight and invited everyone to attend the City Council meeting on September 21, 2004, where the Council will receive a status report on the CVSP effort and the Composite Framework.

Ken Kay explained the public realm, the key land use assumptions, and form-giving elements of the plan. He illustrated several key elements of the public realm. The illustrations included open space and recreation, community parklands, Coyote Lake, Canal Park and Central Commons, primary

non-motorized connections, neighborhood parks, school recreation lands, and public/civic places and art.

Eileen Goodwin of APEX Strategies asked for comments from the Task Force regarding the key elements of the public realm and the following questions and comments were provided:

- Support for the idea of schools connected to parks and open space areas, commenting that this should promote safety.
- Support for preserving the Central Commons with a pedestrian circulation focus.
- Safety is a concern. Should look at substation in conjunction with schools.
- Question about how the north-south circulation and the pedestrian crossings on Santa Teresa will function. *Ken Kay explained the parkway system with its roundabouts and pedestrian underpasses.*
- Question about the location of schools within or adjacent to the Central Commons. *Ken Kay answered in the affirmative, and commented that schools are envisioned to have landmark-quality architecture, and thus would complement views and ambience of the Commons.*
- Comment that it will be a challenge to provide special landmark-quality architecture for the schools given the financial hardships being experienced by most school districts.
- Concern about the proposed modification of Santa Teresa Boulevard, which is currently a predominant north/south through circulation route, and the potential traffic congestion that may be created. *Ken Kay indicated that the concept is not to move cars through the community core quickly and to encourage people to use Hwy 101 and Monterey Road as through routes.*
- Comment that before Hwy 101 was widened people were going through Coyote Valley to Morgan Hill and people still use this route when Hwy 101 is congested and they may continue to do so.
- Comment that a plan with “schools with no cars” won’t work. Vehicular access to schools needs to be preserved.
- Recommendation that there should be recreation within the Commons with no cars, but it could be separate from the schools.
- Question about how the property owners in the area proposed for the Central Commons will be compensated. *This issue is expected to be discussed in January 2005.*
- Comment that the Coyote Lake will be a regional attraction, contrasted to the neighborhood focus of the Central Commons.
- Question about the possibility of relocating the ball fields/open space proposed for the Greenbelt area to north of Palm Avenue, and to redesign them in a more rectangular/linear configuration.
- Commend staff and the consultant team for a lot of good work to date.
- Comment that the CVSP area may not large enough to accommodate all the public realm elements and the required development of 50,000 jobs and 25,000 units.
- Support for the idea of shared parks and schools as long as the safety of the students is ensured.

- Question about the rationale behind locating playfields in the Greenbelt, given the lowest priority given to active recreation as a potential Greenbelt use at the June 12<sup>th</sup> Community Workshop Vision studio.
- Recommendation that any decisions regarding the proposed ballfields in the Greenbelt be delayed until the Greenbelt Property Owners group (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning) makes their recommendation to the Task Force.
- Comment to “have faith that the land use plan will allow for churches” and for the desirability of more intensive use of church sites as opposed to the spread out suburban model.
- Comment that due to the high intensity of the uses being proposed, it is desirable to plan for as many dual and shared uses as possible.
- Concern about mixing animals and people in the Central Commons area. “There are educated animals in Coyote Valley and they’ll know which side of Monterey Road to stay on.”
- Concern about the high cost of the CVSP, noting that large amounts of open space are expensive.
- Recommendation that an issues list be prepared with a timeline of when the issues will be addressed in the CVSP process.
- Concern about the difficulty of analyzing the Composite Framework in the absence of a reliable financial feasibility study.

Darin Smith of Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) explained the findings of the market analysis for the workplace, residential and retail uses:

Workplace: He indicated that the market analysis finds: 1) that the potential driving industries include software, internet, computers bioscience and electronics; 2) that the mix of building types include more office space with higher density buildings; and 3) that there be a mix of environments including some “campus” and some urban. He also identified features that would add value to the workplace, including proximity to transit, retail/services, open space, water features, traffic routes and housing. Darin explained that low-rise workplace development might be more feasible in the near term with mid and high-rise increasing in demand over the longer term. He also stated that there should be a wide mix of workplace building types over several decades.

Residential: Darin explained that the market analysis concludes that at least half of the regional housing demand is expected to be for 1 to 2 person households with a focus on housing close to jobs. He stated that there would be a high demand for single family detached housing and the need for a broad mix of townhomes, “urban” multi-family homes, mixed use, lofts and mid and high- rises as well as a mix of ownership and rental units in a suburban and urban setting. He noted that the features that would add value to residential development included the proximity to transit, retail/services/jobs, water features, open space and schools. He stated that lower density housing would be most feasible in the near term and mid and high-rise residential over the long term. Darin stated that the pace of residential development would be aided by the provision of a wide variety of housing types and price points and that the build-out would take several decades.

Retail: Darin stated that the market analysis concludes that the potential shoppers would primarily be residents of Coyote Valley with some potential capture of sales from the wider region. He suggested that there be a mix of retail types including neighborhood shopping centers (with a grocery store anchor), “community core” shopping (including dining, entertainment and comparison goods and convenience goods) and some freeway-oriented shopping (with a potential for “large format” tenants). Darin stated that the features that add value to retail uses include proximity to traffic routes, jobs, housing, water features and transit. In addition he noted that the neighborhood centers should develop as the households are in place, the community core tenants would increase in demand over the long term and the freeway-oriented centers could happen soon. The analysis recommends three neighborhood centers distributed throughout the Valley and a “community core” center with a multi-plex cinema, restaurants and mixed use.

Overall, Jim Musbach of EPS stated that the specific plan should emphasize the quality of life, encourage diversity, prioritize mixed use in the core, and allow flexibility for changing conditions.

Doug Dahlin of the Dahlin Group explained and illustrated the six land use principles and assumptions for the development of the plan including: 1) Develop appropriate buffering land uses and maintain adequate distance between Metcalf Plant and any residential use; 2) Maintain the Hamlet as a unique historic neighborhood; 3) Maintain a distinct rural break between San Jose and Morgan Hill; 4) Maintain development opportunities for existing industry-driving workplace users; 5) Preserve, protect and transition around existing residential neighborhoods; and 6) Provide the greatest intensity and mix of uses at the community core.

Doug then explained six land use proposals for the plan including: 1) Lower intensity workplace facilities along the railroad; 2) Most (79%) of non-local workers will live to the north so workplaces should remain primarily in the north; 3) Uses should intensify along fixed guide way transit; 4) Local retail should be convenient to both transit and auto; 5) Higher density residential can use structured parking to buffer the railroad; and 6) Residential uses east of Monterey Road can orient to Coyote Creek open space.

Finally, Doug highlighted seven discussion-worthy land use issues identified by the CVSP team, including: 1) A substantial component of industry driving jobs should be accommodated in mixed use areas; 2) Maintain some traditional corporate campus opportunities; 3) Intensify workplace by using structured parking to create opportunities for lower density housing; 4) Provide options for large format and big retail sales tax generators (i.e. auto sales) along Monterey Road; 5) Locate the high school away from the railroad and consider the possibility of two smaller high schools rather than one; 6) Acquisition, agricultural viability, environmental and land value enhancement.

At this point Eileen Goodwin, of Apex Strategies, indicated that the consultants would answer some questions and concerns that were raised at the August 30, 2004 Task Force Meeting. The following questions and answers were provided:

- Will Cal Train service continue south to Morgan Hill and Gilroy? Doug indicated that

Caltrain will be double-tracked from its current location north of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan area, and right-of-way included for the potential California Bullet Train.

- Will there be adequate north-south routes linking Morgan Hill to San Jose? *Doug indicated that the plan does not provide for through traffic through the core area, however there are several other alternate routes planned for north--south traffic circulation including the parkway.*
- Will the cost of the fixed guide way transit be balanced by savings in road construction? *Doug stated that he does expect a significant reduction in traffic, road improvements, and reduced parking ratios, which will help to balance the costs of the fixed guide way system.*
- Will the lake and its relation to groundwater be done in a safe, reliable, cost effective and environmentally sustainable manner? *Doug explained that there are several options for the lake liner, including a clay liner/soil liner and a membrane liner), and the liners will have low porosity to protect the lake water from the groundwater. He stated that the lake would have a 4- foot freeboard around the edges to carry the 10-year to 100-year storm waters.*
- What about transit for areas not served by the fixed guide way? *Doug indicated that there are areas on the east side of Monterey Road and some other areas in the southeastern part of the plan that do not warrant extension of the fixed guide way system but that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is planned to loop through those areas to provide convenient transit service.*

Eileen asked for comments and questions from the Task Force regarding market findings and the six land use principles and assumptions. The following were received:

Market analysis:

- Comment that property owners will be carrying very high costs and the Task Force needs to know all cost information now (what the costs will be and who will pay them) before they develop a preferred alternative, and start the EIR.
- Comment that open space can be designed to generate money and this should be considered.
- Comment commending staff and the team for putting in as much open space and recreation in the plan.
- Recommend a more linear open space in Greenbelt along Palm Avenue.
- Comment that urban uses are too close to agriculture and there will be conflicts. Agricultural uses should be limited and carefully located.
- Recommendation that any plan for agriculture in the Greenbelt should include buffers between urban uses and farming.

Land Use Principles and the Assumptions:

- Support for buffering land uses and maintaining adequate distance from the Metcalf Plant.
- Support for maintaining the “Coyote Hamlet”
- Question as to whether it would be possible to rebuild the Coyote Valley Inn and get the post office back from Kelley Park.
- Support for South Coyote as a permanent, non-urban buffer between San Jose and Morgan Hill.
- Support for keeping the three existing workplaces and adding in mixed use.
- Support for the preservation of the two existing residential areas in the Urban Reserve.
- Comment that the buffer to the south is a great idea but question as to how far north it should go (should be minimal).
- Support for the greatest intensity in core area.
- Support for mix of uses in the near term and comment that lower density first should be discouraged.
- Concern that while the majority of traffic will be coming from the north, in the am/pm peak hour there are some employment needs that should be considered in the Coyote Creek Golf Drive Freeway Interchange area (maybe north of intersection with Monterey Rd).
- Concern that the market might yield low-density single-family dwellings and low-rise workplace uses.
- Question as to how the mix of uses can be achieved from the beginning to ensure that we don’t just get residential.
- Support for increasing densities along both the new fixed transit guideway and the existing railroad tracks along Monterey Road. *Doug indicated that the lower density uses are recommended for the areas that are more than ½ to ¾ mile away from the main station.*
- Recommendation for flexibility in the Greenbelt so as not to prematurely close any options.
- Concern about the proposed intensive commercial uses near the freeway and question as to what types of uses are envisioned.
- Concern that there are still no answers to the questions that were previously asked about feasibility, infrastructure costs and lower cost alternatives.

Eileen indicated that many of these questions would be answered in more detail at future Task Force meetings. She stated that in the interest of time, comments on the rest of the land use proposals, assumptions and issues (from slide 31 of the PowerPoint presentation) would be continued to the next meeting.

#### **4. Presentation on the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt:**

Lee Wieder of the Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Growth (CVAFSG) presented a PowerPoint presentation describing their vision and goals for the Greenbelt. He indicated that the Greenbelt is the most developed area of the Coyote Valley with 70% of the parcels less than 5 acres in size, 50% of the parcels 2.5 acres or less and only 12 parcels that are larger than 12 acres. He showed several photos of the Greenbelt indicating that there are a lot of abandoned greenhouses and that agriculture is bankrupt throughout the area. He stated that the land is chopped up and new development will continue in the Greenbelt without a vision.

He explained that their vision for the Greenbelt includes: permanent greenbelt “gateways,” permanent open space, extensive walking and biking trails, farmer’s markets, culinary schools and restaurants using locally grown foods, rural residential uses clustered in areas that preserve view corridors, and input from those who live in this area. They also presented a draft preliminary land use proposal for the Greenbelt which identified specific areas under Williamson Act contracts, a farmer’s market, a 400- foot peach blossom corridor along Santa Teresa Blvd., a sports facility, agricultural education and community gardens, recreation and trails, rural residential uses, and agricultural related retail uses. He asked that their vision and their preliminary plan be included in the EIR.

Richard DeSmet, also with the CVAFSG, reiterated the conditions of the Greenbelt, the lot size information and stated that his family has owned land in this area for generations and they have seen farming fail and there’s no housing for workers. He indicated that due to the high labor costs and other costs farming cannot succeed and there is not one commercially viable prune orchard in Santa Clara Valley.

He indicated that they have hired a consultant and their team has developed an exciting vision for the Greenbelt which includes: Santa Teresa Blvd. with a 200-foot open space buffer on both sides, rural residential clustered units to preserve the open areas, a 50-acre sports park, a culinary school and restaurants with locally grown produce. He indicated that he would leave a copy of the PowerPoint presentation so it could be made available to the Task Force members.

## **5. Public Comments:**

- Tim Steele representing Sobrato Development Corporation stated that Sobrato has owned land in this area for 30 years and the biggest hurdle has been the cost of infrastructure to the area. He recommended that there be an analysis of the cost of infrastructure early on. He stated that they would like to see industry be built very early in the Plan implementation. They support a plan with good planning principles, and financing.
- Chris from Los Altos has been a property owner for 30 years and had to clear the prune trees because they were not profitable. Her family paid \$10,000 an acre for their



property. She supports careful and fair planning for the Greenbelt so it ties into the rest of the plan.

- Eric Brandenburg owns 58 acres at the end of Laguna Avenue and owns all of the hills to the west. He offered to provide the hillside areas for public trails and public access. He stated that half of his property is designated open space. He thinks that the Plan as proposed is short by 3,000 units. He also recommended that answers be provided to the questions about costs before the plan goes to the Council.
- Chris Allen, a property owner in Coyote Valley, bought land to build a greenhouse for his indoor plant business, however due to the County's stiff regulations which categorized his proposal like a big commercial entity he was required to pay thousands of dollars over and above what other counties require and as a result had to abandon his plans. He supports the Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Growth's proposed vision.
- Kyle Simpson of the Greenbelt Alliance disagrees with the plan which he feels provides for majority of industrial uses in the north and the housing in the south, stating that the City Council asked for the land uses to be integrated and not separate. He believes that this plan would result in standard sprawl with separation of land uses and he recommends more mixed-use retail rather than the suburban-style shopping centers currently depicted in the plan.
- Rebecca Tolentino of the City of Morgan Hill indicated that Morgan Hill continues to be concerned about traffic impacts to Morgan Hill. They feel that the City is moving ahead with a plan without looking at the traffic considerations. They still want a meeting with VTA, County Roads and the City departments to look at potential traffic impacts. She stated that the plan does not really deal with land uses yet.
- Marty Estrada agrees with the Mayor that we can't have schools without cars and he agrees that we need to look at costs. He agrees that churches should be provided in the plan. He also said that Lee Wieder still has not received the answers to his questions.
- Brian Schmidt of the Committee for Green Foothills stated that the ideas that work in Santa Barbara would not work in Coyote Valley. He indicated that the jobs housing balance is not being dealt with properly and there is an inadequate number of housing units being planned. They also oppose the separation of jobs and housing land uses and recommend that staff make this clear to the City Council. They recommend against the housing coming first.

Laurel Prevetti indicated that a number of land uses options are being explored and there is no commitment at this time to any one land use scheme or phasing concept. In addition, she

stated that there is a lot more analysis of traffic, economic issues and infrastructure issues that will occur over the next several months.

Laurel indicated that there is a community meeting on September 28, 2004 at the Southside Community Center to discuss land uses and an opportunity for the community to provide more input.

The Task Force recommended that there be one meeting for an exchange of ideas and a roundtable discussion and staff stated that they would work on that. The Task Force also asked staff to prepare a list of issues and a timeframe for their resolution. Laurel indicated that staff has already begun the issues list.

Laurel indicated that on September 21<sup>st</sup> the City Council is only receiving a status report regarding the Composite Framework but not land uses. She stated that staff is planning to return to the City Council with a land use concept later this fall before the EIR is formally initiated.

## **6. Adjourn:**

The meeting was adjourned at about 7:35 p.m. The next Community Meeting is scheduled for September 28, 2004, and the next Task Force meeting will be on October 4, 2-004.